

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE A-9

NEW YORK TIMES
25 MARCH 1983

Soviet Sees a Treaty Violation In Arms Proposed by Reagan

By SERGE SCHMEMMANN

Special to The New York Times

MOSCOW, March 24 — The Soviet press said today that President Reagan's plan for new antimissile technologies amounted to a new stage in the arms race and that their deployment would violate the 1972 treaty limiting such systems.

Official commentaries also depicted Mr. Reagan's speech as an effort by the Administration to push its arms buildup through the Congress.

The Soviet responses consisted of summaries of the President's televised address, referring to his "beloved theme" of a Soviet military threat and accusing him of using "figures about the Soviet military potential fabricated by the Central Intelligence Agency to try and justify the unprecedented military expenditures."

One commentary, by Tass, the Soviet Government's press agency, focused on Mr. Reagan's proposed program "to counter the awesome Soviet missile strength with measures that are defensive."

Research Consistent With Pact

Mr. Reagan said the research and development of the new technologies would be "consistent with our obligations under the antiballistic missile treaty" and would pave the way for steps to eliminate offensive weapons.

Tass quoted senior Administration officials as having said that the new technologies would be based on land and in space and would include lasers. The press agency added:

"The deployment of such antiballistic missile systems would be a direct violation of the Soviet-American agreement and protocols, according to which the United States had the right to move the existing ABM system from the ICBM base at Grand Forks only to the region of the capital.

"Thus, what is being talked about is a new attempt by the United States to achieve superiority in strategic arms over the Soviet Union and to upset the existing rough balance of power."

When the ABM treaty was signed in 1972, it limited deployment of antiballistic missiles to two sites, including the national capital. A 1974 protocol, or amendment, reduced the two sites to one. However, in accord with a 1975 Congressional directive, the single American site, at Grand Forks, N.D., was deactivated and dismantled.

The treaty limited defensive missile systems on the premise that their deployment might reduce incentives to negotiate limitations on offensive weapons by fostering a sense of security against attack. While the treaty did place restrictions on some forms of research and development, wide areas remained open, including the exploration of new technologies.

Though the treaty was of unlimited duration, the two sides agreed to review it at five-year intervals.

Other Soviet commentaries were less specific, and Western diplomats expected a more authoritative response after closer Soviet study of the President's speech. They noted that Soviet

criticism of Mr. Reagan had been comparatively muted in recent weeks, possibly reflecting a re-evaluation of official attitudes toward the United States in light of a growing Soviet feeling that Mr. Reagan will be re-elected.

The Government newspaper *Izvestia* said that "only in the 24th minute of his speech did Reagan finally begin saying that his Administration, you see, was dedicated to ideas of peace and disarmament."

The paper said the "destabilizing idea" of accelerating research on new defenses against missiles was slipped in "just before the curtain."

"The speech thus underscored that the White House had no desire of retreating from its unrealistic positions," *Izvestia* said, "and this stubborn unwillingness to get out of the rut of the cold war increasingly transforms Washington into a dangerous breeding ground for thermonuclear confrontation."

'Sermon in Militarism'

Novosti, a feature syndicate, branded the speech as "a sermon in militarism" and declared that his proposal "clearly indicates his intentions to perpetuate the arms race and carry it over into the 21st century."

Novosti and Tass rejected Mr. Reagan's assertion of a growing Soviet military threat, which he outlined to support his request for more military spending. The Soviet Union insists that there is rough parity in military strength between the two sides.

Tass quoted various Congressional critics of the military budget to the effect that the President's sole goal was to "scare the American people and the Congress to death and get even more money for military needs."

"The real aims of the address made themselves especially clear when the President bitterly attacked the Congress, which has lately been making modest attempts to somewhat cut the unprecedented military spending on the ground that it is destroying the United States economy,"

STAT